DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 310 SP 012 266

AUTHOR Lemlech, Johanna Kasin; Sikula, John P.
TITLE Do the Values of First Year Education Students and Successful Urban Teachers Differ?
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association (Toronto, Canada, March 27-31, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Job Satisfaction; Middle Class Values; Personality Theories; *Personal Values; *Predictive Validity; *Success Factors; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Placement; *Urban Teaching

ABSTRACT

A survey of 18 values held by selected groups of preservice teaching candidates and by successful, urban, secondary-school teachers showed a divergence that can be expected to affect personal characteristics and teacher behaviors, as well as instructional success or failure in a variety of teaching environments. The two groups differed significantly on nine terminal values, with students holding the following in higher esteem than the teachers: comfortable life, pleasure, and social recognition. Students valued equality, freedom, inner harmony, self-respect, and true friendship less than the teaching group. The data appeared to support the contention that trainees would be "culturally shocked" and frustrated when they encounter the realities of innercity teaching. It is suggested that this shock and frustration can be avoided if, in the selection and placement of teachers in urban school settings, some attention is paid to their value profiles, which can be used to prevent the placing of unprepared candidates in teaching situations where they are likely to fail or be frustrated and disappointed. (MJB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED151310

DO THE VALUES OF FIRST YEAR EDUCATION STUDENTS AND SUCCESSFUL URBAN TEACHERS DIFFER?

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BY

Johanna Kasin Lemlech
Associate Professor
School of Education
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90007

John P. Sikula
Professor of Education
Chairman, Division of Education
Indiana University Northwest
Gary, Indiana 46408

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John P. Sikula
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

"Printed in U.S.A."

SP012 266

CANDIDATE SELECTION, A PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Decreasing birth rates and a so called oversupply of teachers have led many schools of education to consider curtailing the preparation of new teachers. Formulas for teacher supply and demand traditionally have been based upon the numbers of students attending public and private schools as compared to the number of individuals certified to teach. Yet, recent studies of supply and demand in education have failed to reveal to the public the shortages of quality personnel and the specificity of learner needs still to be met. For instance, there is a definite shortage of early childhood and preschool teachers. Specifically trained personnel are needed to perform many new specialized roles such as learning resource teachers, diagnosticians, computer specialists, evaluation specialists, and community liaisons (Corrigan, 1974; Lemlech, 1977).

These professional shortages reflect both a lack of public commitment to support education and a challenge to teacher educators to prepare teachers to match specific learner needs. Historically, the identification of qualified individuals for teacher preparation was left to chance (Lemlech, Marks, 1976). Many professionals believed that it was a student's right to choose his career. For this reason institutions typically used criteria based upon college grades, proficiency in English and speech, personal references, physical examinations, and "why I want to teach" statements (Study Commission, University of Nebraska, 1974). The validity of these criteria to produce

qualified teachers to meet specific program goals should have been questioned long ago.

During the 1950's and 1960's teacher educators met the challenge of classroom teacher shortages through accelerated programs aimed at producing a large quantity of teachers. But in the 1970's and 1980's the challenge is producing quality and specialized trainees. New guidelines for teacher candidate selection and new criteria for excellence need to be investigated.

Recently the National Institute of Education reported evaluation data which seem to indicate some characteristics of successful schools and teaching (McDaniels, 1974). Their data revealed an emerging pattern of success in "mission-oriented" schools where goals were clearly defined and teachers and instructional tools were directed toward accomplishing those goals. For teacher educators this pattern would indicate the need for preparation programs precisely designed for specific schools and communities to accomplish specific needs and goals. The NIE research verifies what many educators have instinctively felt for years; that is, to describe good teaching and successful teachers, one must describe the population and the purposes being served.

In the Texas Teacher Effectiveness Project, Brophy (1976) reported finding that successful teacher behavior differed depending upon the socioeconomic status of the school. Once again it appears that successful teaching is situation bound or

as the NIE report stated "mission-oriented." Neither the NIE report nor the Texas Teacher Effectiveness Project characterized successful teachers with specific attributes. Brophy indicated that teacher behavior was dependent upon student behavior and that close attention to student differences determined optimal teacher behavior. For teacher educators the prime questions still are, if there are no specific prerequisite teacher attributes for success in a special school and program, should all candidates be accepted for preparation and can any candidate be prepared to teach utilizing specific program goals?

VALUE RESEARCH

Milton Rokeach has investigated the organization of value-attitude systems. He has distinguished between attitudes and values and between instrumental and terminal values. His studies reveal that while the average adult possesses thousands of attitudes toward specific objects or situations, he holds only a few instrumental values and even fewer terminal values (Rokeach, 1968).

A value represents an individual's enduring belief. Values may be either positive or negative. Values function as a base-line to facilitate evaluation and comparison between self-conduct and the conduct of others. Values impel choices, feelings, and actions. Values describe what is important to the individual Instrumental values are considered "means" to achieve individual

goals; terminal values describe end-states of existence and represent the individual's life goals (Rokeach, 1968).

Groups of values form a "value system" which acts as a frame of reference to evaluate behavior and experience in terms of personal life goals. The Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey (1951) Scale of Values enables a researcher to measure the relative order of importance of six life themes. Both the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Scale of Values and the Rokeach Value Survey have been used by researchers to describe value differences and similarities between individuals and groups.

Sikula, Lemlech, and Stanley used the Rokeach Value Survey to investigate value differences between practicing teachers identified by principals and others as successful or nonsuccessful. Their study revealed value differences in four terminal values (A Comfortable Life, Equality, National Security, and Self-respect) and in five instrumental values (Ambitious, Capable, Obedient, Polite, and Self-controlled). Successful teachers ranked Equality, Self-respect, Ambition, and Capability higher than did the non-successful teachers (Sikula, et al., 1976). In another study, Sikula and Lemlech (1976) investigated value differences between black and white teachers. The Rokeach Value Survey again detected significant differences between these two groups of teachers.

PROCEDURES USED IN THIS STUDY

To begin teacher preparation at USC, students are required to enroll in a social foundations course. Customarily students begin their preparation during their junior or senior year. The

majority of the students are between the ages of 18 and 21 years and represent diverse social class backgrounds. The course is offered at different times to accommodate individual program needs. During the first week of classes in the Fall of 1975, twenty-three students who enrolled in one section of the course were administered the Rokeach Value Survey (Form D). Respondents to this survey rank-ordered two sets of eighteen values (terminal values and instrumental values) designating each value with a priority number from one, the highest priority, to eighteen, the lowest and least important priority. Respondents were asked to "arrange the values in order of their importance to YOU, as guiding principles in YOUR life."

The rankings of the twenty-three prospective teacher candidates were then compared with forty-seven teachers, primarily at the secondary level, who had been identified by their administrators or others in prior research as successful urban teachers. The successful teacher group represented diverse socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds. These teachers taught at metropolitan or inner-city schools in Los Angeles, California or Denver, Colorado (Sikula, et al., 1976).

RESULTS

Data were analyzed utilizing the X^2 test for two independent samples. Data analysis revealed significant differences in the distribution of nine terminal values and six instrumental values. Table 1 summarizes the rankings and results for terminal values while Table 2 summarizes the results for instrumental values.

TABLE 1

TERMINAL VALUES

Value	Rank by Students	Rank by Teachers	Probability of Difference
A comfortable life	1	12	< .001
An exciting life	14	13	not significant
A sense of accomplishment	3	5	not significant
A world of beauty	16	14	not significant
A world at peace	6	11	not significant
Equality	15	7	< .01
Family security	11	6	not significant
Freedom	17	4	< .001
Happiness	9	8	not significant
Inner harmony	10	2	< .02
Mature love	7	9	not significant
National security	18	18	not significant
Pleasure	4	17	< .001
Salvation	8	15	< .01
Self-respect	5	1	< .001
Social recognition	12	16	< .01
True friendship	13	10	< .001
Wisdom	2	3	not significant

Groups differ significantly as whole groups at < = .001.

TABLE 2

INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

Value	Rank by Students	Rank by Teachers	Probability of Difference
Ambitious	12	10	not significant
Broadminded	3	5	not significant
Capable	6	3	not significant
Cheerful	7	5	< .001
Clean	11	16	< .001
Courageous	10	8	not significant
Forgiving	17	14	not significant
Helpful	9	12	not significant
Honest	13	1	< .01
Imaginative	1	13	< .001
Independent	8	4	not significant
Intellectual	15	6	< .02
Logical	2	9	< .05
Loving	5	7	not significant
Obedient	18	18	not significant
Polite	16	17	not significant
Responsible	4	2	not significant
Self-controlled	14	11	not significant

Groups differ significantly as whole groups at < = .001.

DISCUSSION

The two groups differed significantly on nine terminal values. Students valued a comfortable life, pleasure, salvation and social recognition higher than the successful teachers. Students were less concerned than the teachers with equality, freedom, inner harmony, self-respect and true friendship.

On instrumental values, the students were more concerned than the teachers with being cheerful, clean, imaginative and logical. They valued less than the teachers honesty and intellect. The results taken together appear to indicate that students are quite naive and idealistic about the realities of successful urban teaching. If such trainees expect from teaching a comfortable life, pleasure, social recognition and salvation of some sort and are not as concerned with the important realities of urban teaching which center around the values of equality, freedom, inner harmony, self-respect and friendship, then they are in for rude awakenings. The successful teachers value more than the students honesty and intellect, and appear to have a more mature understanding of what is important and valued in the urban setting. The teachers are less concerned than students with being cheerful, clean and imaginative, traits which apparently are middle-class ideals which are more superficial and less important to inner-city residents.

The data appear to support the idea of many educators who have suggested that middle-class teacher preparation institutions are filled with trainees who are going to be "culturally shocked" and frustrated when they encounter the realities of inner-city teaching. Accounts of such shock pervade the educational literature of the 1960's.

Both the student and teacher groups were mixed racially, sexually and socioeconomically and therefore, these variables cannot reasonably be assumed to be causal factors affecting the results. The results seem to reinforce and provide some empirical support for the belief that the theory presented in teacher training institutions is somehow at odds with the practical realities of successful teaching in urban schools. This belief certainly has descriptive support in educational literature. Teaching candidates appear naive about the real rewards of teaching. Teaching successfully in the urban environment is not fun, imaginative, logical or monetarily very rewarding but rather is hard work in which one must invest self-respect, freedom, honesty, intellect and human dignity. Experienced teachers appear to rely for personal meaning upon ideals and values more mundane than salvation.

IMPLICATIONS

This research demonstrates that successful urban teachers and teacher trainees differ significantly in their value systems. It suggests or at least implies that cultural shock and frustration can be avoided if in the selection and placement of teachers in urban school settings, some attention is paid to their value profiles which can be used to prevent the placing of naive liberals in teaching situations where they are likely to fail and be frustrated and disappointed. The value choices made on value surveys are reflection of cultural and personal differences and can be used to predict interpersonal conflicts (Seagoe, 1946 and Tanner, 1954). These and other studies suggest that students going into teaching for economic security are particularly subject to disappointment today (See also, Sikula, et al., 1976).

Freedom and equality appear to be key values for successful urban teachers. Students unconcerned with these values will experience much conflict and unhappiness in urban schools. Urban educators concerned with placing successful teachers in urban schools need to be aware of the high likelihood of failure for teachers who do not rank these values highly.

CONCLUSION

Teacher selection and placement cannot be left to chance. Better ways of predicting success for urban teachers are available through the use of value profile data. It is time that educators paid more serious attention to the descriptive and empirical accounts of personality characteristics that emerge when analyzing successful urban teacher profiles.

Discounting these data will only result in the general prolongation of urban educational problems and more specifically in the continued ineffectiveness of inner-city teaching which has been so thoroughly documented in educational research and practice for many years. The time has come for change and improvement in urban schools, and there is no more appropriate place to begin than with the selection and placement of teachers who are entrusted to teach there.

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W.; Vernon, P. E., & Lindzey, G. Study of values. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951.

Brophy, Jere E. Reflections on research in elementary schools. Journal of Teacher Education, Spring, 1976, 1, 31-34.

Corrigan, Dean C. Do we have a teacher surplus? Journal of Teacher Education. Fall, 1974, 3, 196-198.

Haberman, Martin. Needed: New guidelines for teacher candidate selection. Journal of Teacher Education, Fall, 1974, 3, 234-235.

Lemlech, Johanna K. Handbook for successful urban teaching. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1977.

Lemlech, Johanna K., & Marks, Merle. The American teacher: A search for identity. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, April, 1976.

McDaniels, Garry L. Successful teaching and successful schools. National Institute of Education position paper, Washington, D. C., 1974.

Rokeach, Milton. Beliefs, attitudes, and values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Seagoe, May V. Prediction of in-service success in teaching. Journal of Educational Research, 1946, 39, 658-663.

Siegel, S. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

Sikula, John P., & Lemlech, Johanna K. Do black and white teachers have different values? Phi Delta Kappan, May, 1976, 623-624.

Sikula, John P.; Lemlech, Johanna K.; & Stanley, Mary Ann. Do the values of successful and nonsuccessful urban teachers differ? Ohio Elementary School Principal , December, 1976.

Study commission on undergraduate education and the education of teachers. University of Nebraska. Journal of Teacher Education, Fall, 1974, 3, 237.

Tanner, W. C., Jr. Personality bases in teacher selection. Phi Delta Kappan, 1954, 35, 271-277.